



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:
Daniel I. Kerpelman et al.
Serial No.: 09/470,344
Filed: December 22, 1999
For: MEDICAL FACILITY
COMMUNICATIONS TOPOLOGY

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 3626
Examiner: Morgan, Robert W.
Atty. Docket: GEMS:0065/YOD
15-SV-5373

AF/3626
#9/a(4)
Lowman
12-5-02

OK to
enter
RWM
12/19/02

Assistant Commissioner
for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date below:	
11/25/02 Date	Lynda Howell Lynda Howell

**RESPONSE TO FINAL
OFFICE ACTION MAILED SEPTEMBER 25, 2002**

RECEIVED
DEC 05 2002
GROUP

Dear Sir:

In the Office Action mailed on September 25, 2002, claims 1-60 were rejected under 35 U.S. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,260,021) in view of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary and with some claims in further view of Evans (U. S. Pat No. 5,924,074). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness falls on the Examiner. *Ex parte Wolters and Kuypers*, 214 U.S.P.Q. 735 (PTO Bd. App. 1979). Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 U.S.P.Q. 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, to establish a *prima*